



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
 United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 P.O. Box 1450  
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

QUINE INTELLECTUAL  
 PROPERTY LAW GROUP, P.C.  
 P O BOX 458  
 ALAMEDA CA 94501

MAILED

JAN 03 2011

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :  
 Alfonta, et al. :  
 Application No. 10/575,991 :  
 Filed: 13 March, 2006 :  
 Attorney Docket No: 54-000711US :

DECISION

This is a decision on the petition filed on 5 October, 2010, considered as a petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181 (no fee) requesting withdrawal of the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application, alternatively pleaded as a "contingent" petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) for revival of an application abandoned due to unintentional delay.

**NOTE:**

For the second time Petitioner appears to have ignored the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c) as to the showing requirements regarding the relief sought herein.

Petitioner is respectfully requested to:

- review the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c) as to the showing required in this matter;
- provide the express statements outlined therein; and
- provide the two brief documents required.

Petitioners always are reminded that those registered to practice **must** inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to inquire and disclose.<sup>1</sup> Registered practitioners do not satisfy this requirement simply by placing into the statements others the required showings herein.

<sup>1</sup> See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on Petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

Application No. 10/575,991

The petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181 is **DISMISSED**; and the petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR §1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181" or "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR §1.137(b)."

This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. §704.

As to the Request to Withdraw  
the Holding of Abandonment

*Petitioner is directed to the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I) for guidance as to the proper showing requirements for relief under 37 C.F.R. §1.181.*

Petitioner appears not to comply with the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I)—as discussed below, Petitioner has failed to satisfy the showing requirements set forth there. Petitioner may find it beneficial to review that material and move step-wise through that guidance in the effort to satisfy the showing requirements (statements and supporting documentation).

As to the Allegations  
of Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement and/or showing of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee

*It appears that Petitioner has not satisfied the fee requirements pursuant to the regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b).*

*Petitioners' attentions always are directed to the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(II).*

BACKGROUND

The record reflects as follows:

Application No. 10/575,991

Petitioner failed to reply timely and properly to the non-final Office action mailed on 13 November, 2009, with reply due absent extension of time on or before 13 January, 2010.

The application went abandoned by operation of law after midnight 13 January, 2010.

The Office mailed the Notice of Abandonment on 1 June, 2010.

On 21 June, 2010, Petitioner Gary Baker (Reg. No. 41,595) filed, *inter alia*, a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181 and averred, *inter alia*, non-receipt of the Office action but failed to make the statements and documentary showing as required and expressly set forth in the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I)—including the required copy of the application docket sheet, Petitioner's office due date calendar for the due date of the reply. Petitioner failed to make the statements, *inter alia*:

- non-receipt at the correspondence address of record;
- search (of the file, docket and calendar) and non-discovery with description of the docketing system;
- sufficient reliability with a showing/statement that the due date calendar is that for Petitioner's office/firm, all to ensure, *inter alia*, that the Office action herein had not been misfiled.

Further, Petitioner stated that he was including a "contingent" petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) and averred inclusion of fees, but the record is silent as to any indication that fees were paid and there was no deposit account or other authorization provided for fees. Petitioner included a reply in the form of an amendment and made a statement of unintentional delay.

The petitions were dismissed on 17 August, 2010.

On 5 October, 2010, Petitioner re-advanced the petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181 and averred, *inter alia*, non-receipt of the Office action but failed to make the statements and documentary showing as required and expressly set forth in the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I)—including the required copy of the application docket sheet, Petitioner's office due date calendar for the due date of the reply. Petitioner failed to make the statements, *inter alia*:

- non-receipt at the correspondence address of record;
- sufficient reliability with a showing/statement that the due date calendar is that for Petitioner's office/firm, all to ensure, *inter alia*, that the Office action herein had not been misfiled.

Application No. 10/575,991

Further, Petitioner stated that he was including a "contingent" petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) with fee and reply in the form of an amendment and made a statement of unintentional delay.

Because the Office wishes to allow Petitioner to complete his showing (if he is able) as to the petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181, and not simply charge Petitioner for a petition the petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b), the Office requests that Petitioner review and seek to satisfy the guidance requirements as set forth in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I).

Thus, Petitioner has not completed the showing as discussed below in the citation from the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP).

Petitioner is directed to the appropriate guidance (MPEP §711.03(c)), and requested to comply with it.

With regard to Petitioner's request to withdraw the holding of abandonment pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181, the guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I) provides in pertinent part as to non-receipt:

\*\*\*

The showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office communication must include a statement from the practitioner describing the system used for recording an Office action received at the correspondence address of record with the USPTO. The statement should establish that the docketing system is sufficiently reliable. It is expected that the record would include, but not be limited to, the application number, attorney docket number, the mail date of the Office action and the due date for the response.

Practitioner must state that the Office action was not received at the correspondence address of record, and that a search of the practitioner's record(s), including any file jacket or the equivalent, and the application contents, indicates that the Office action was not received. A copy of the record(s) used by the practitioner where the non-received Office action would have been entered had it been received is required.

A copy of the practitioner's record(s) required to show non-receipt of the Office action should include the master docket for the firm. That is, if a three month period for reply was set in the nonreceived Office action, a copy of the master docket report showing all replies docketed for a date three months from the mail date of the nonreceived Office action must be submitted as documentary proof of nonreceipt of the Office action. If no such master docket exists, the practitioner should so state and provide other evidence such as, but not limited to, the following: the application file jacket; incoming mail log;

Application No. 10/575,991

calendar; reminder system; or the individual docket record for the application in question.<sup>2</sup>

Alternatively, the requirements for a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) have been set forth above and are set forth again below for Petitioner's information.

Out of an abundance of caution, Petitioners always are reminded that:

- the filing of a petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181 does not toll any periods that may be running any action by the Office and a petition seeking relief under the regulation must be filed within two (2) months of the act complained of (*see*: 37 C.F.R. §1.181(f)); and
- those registered to practice and all others who make representations before the Office **must** inquire into the underlying facts of representations made to the Office and support averments with the appropriate documentation—since all owe to the Office the continuing duty to inquire and disclose.

The availability of applications and application papers online to applicants/practitioners who diligently associate their Customer Number with the respective application(s) now provides an applicant/practitioner on-demand information as to events/transactions in an application.

## STATUTES, REGULATIONS

Congress has authorized the Commissioner to "revive an application if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner to have been "unavoidable." 35 U.S.C. §133 (1994).

The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) and (b) set forth the requirements for a Petitioner to revive a previously unavoidably or unintentionally, respectively, abandoned application.<sup>4, 5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See: MPEP §711.03(c ) (I)(A).

<sup>3</sup> See supplement of 17 June, 1999. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on Petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting a statement made by Petitioner. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 C.F.R. §10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing statements to the Patent and Trademark Office).

<sup>4</sup> See: Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. at 53158-59 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 86-87 (October 21, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> The language of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a) is clear, unambiguous, and without qualification: the delay in tendering the reply to the outstanding Office action, as well as filing the first petition seeking revival, must have been unavoidable for the reply now to be accepted on petition. (Therefore, by example, an unavoidable delay in the payment of the Filing Fee might occur if a reply is shipped by the US Postal Service, but due to catastrophic accident, the delivery is not made.) Delays in responding properly raise the question whether delays are unavoidable. Where there is a question whether the delay was unavoidable, Petitioners must meet the burden of establishing that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §133 and 37 C.F.R. §1.137(a). And the Petitioner must be diligent in attending to the matter. Failure to do so does not constitute the care required under Pratt, and so cannot satisfy the test for diligence and due care. (By contrast, unintentional

Application No. 10/575,991

Allegations as to the Request to  
Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment

The guidance in the Commentary at MPEP §711.03(c)(I) specifies the showing required and how it is to be made and supported.

Petitioner appears not to have made the showing required.

As to Allegations of  
Unintentional Delay

The requirements of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) are the petition and fee therefor, a reply, a proper statement of unintentional delay under the regulation, and, where applicable, a terminal disclaimer and fee.

It appears that the requirements under the rule have not been satisfied.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181 is **dismissed**; and the petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.137(b) is **dismissed**.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By Mail:                      Mail Stop PETITION  
                                    Commissioner for Patents  
                                    P. O. Box 1450  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:                      U. S. Patent and Trademark Office  
                                    Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions  
                                    Randolph Building  
                                    401 Dulany Street  
                                    Alexandria, VA 22314


By facsimile:                **(571) 273-8300**  
                                    Attn: Office of Petitions

---

delays are those that do not satisfy the very strict statutory and regulatory requirements of unavoidable delay, and also, by definition, are not intentional.))

Application No. 10/575,991

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision may be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3214—it is noted, however, that all practice before the Office is in writing (see: 37 C.F.R. §1.2<sup>6</sup>) and the proper authority for action on any matter in this regard are the statutes (35 U.S.C.), regulations (37 C.F.R.) and the commentary on policy (MPEP). Therefore, no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's action(s).



/John J. Gillon, Jr./  
John J. Gillon, Jr.  
Senior Attorney  
Office of Petitions

<sup>6</sup> The regulations at 37 C.F.R. §1.2 provide:

**§1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.**

All business with the Patent and Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.